UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,399	06/26/2001	Fernando Incertis Carro	FR920000027US1	2163

7590 06/07/2006

IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT.IQOA/BLDG. 040-3
1701 NORTH STR EET
ENDICOTT,, NY 13760

EXAMINER	
TRAN, QUOC A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 09/892,399	**Applicant(s)** CARRO, FERNANDO INCERTIS	
	Examiner Quoc A. Tran	**Art Unit** 2176	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-10,18-25 and 31-38*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 05/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 9-48 that the combination of Robinson, and Musk and Thompson do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 1-10, 18-25 and 31-38.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees, using the broadest interpretation, Robinson, and Musk and Thompson do teach all of the features of claims 1-10, 18-25 and 31-38, which presented in the Final Office Action mailed 03/15/2006, and for further support The examiner respectfully notes that,

Robinson teaches in section 4.1 that the animated documents may be created with a WYSIWYG editor, or in other words and electronic document editor. Therefore, the documents maybe created in electronic form prior to being printed out. Robinson offers further evidence of this in sections 4 and 4.4, in section 4 that an adaptor may be used to import or export hypertext By enabling the registry to import hypertext, Robinson is teaching that the document may have an electronic origin. Furthermore, in section 4.4 teaches that given URL, the information can be captured on the associated web page in the registry. Again, this demonstrates that the origin of the document in the registry may be electronic and not paper. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson and Musk does teach the electronic document not being derived from the physical document.

Musk teaches a map document, which contains reference items, related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 32-57. The map facilitates a user search of business services in a particular geographic area and in fig. 3 is a flowchart illustrating the operation from both the user and the server, wherein user first contacts the server website. The contact is acknowledged and a search client (e.g., a Sun Microsystems Java applet or a Microsoft activeX) is sent back to the user; then user receives the applet and may initiate a search request. The search request is then transmitted to server, and a search is performed ans in another aspect of Musk teaching at col. 1, lines 45-57 discloses a map is transmitted with both graphical information and ASCII text. The ASCII text is encoded into either a few lines of pixels of the raster map, or in unused colors throughout the map. This encoding allows the map with its text to more easily propagate through Java, and

Thompson teaches a high contrast organic light emitting device (OLED) display utilizing a transparent (TOLED), the contrast of images displayed by the display is thus improved display which have substantially transparent conducting layers which can be used in a wide variety of applications, including computer displays, informational displays in vehicles, television monitors, telephones, printers, illuminated signs, large-area screens and billboards (see Thompson at he Abstract and Fig. 2). Using the broadest interpretation the examiner reads a high contrast organic light emitting device (OLED) display utilizing a transparent (TOLED) would have been an inherent of the notoriously well-known uses of such display to provide feedback to a user.

Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback in combination with Musk teaching, a map document, which contains reference items, related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1, lines 32-57. The map facilitates a user search of business services in a particular geographic area and in fig. 3 is a flowchart illustrating the operation from both the user and the server, wherein user first contacts the server website. The contact is acknowledged and a search client (e.g., a Sun Microsystems Java applet or a Microsoft activeX) is sent back to the user; then user receives the applet and may initiate a search request. The search request is then transmitted to server, and a search is performed ans in another aspect of Musk teaching at col. 1, lines 45-57 discloses a map is transmitted with both graphical information and ASCII text. The ASCII text is encoded into either a few lines of pixels of the raster map, or in unused colors throughout the map. This encoding allows the map with its text to more easily propagate through Java.

And for further support the examiner respectfully notes that, Robinson teaches inn section 4.1 that the animated documents may be created with a WYSIWYG editor, or in other words and electronic document editor. Therefore, the documents maybe created in electronic form prior to being printed out. Robinson offers further evidence of this in sections 4 and 4.4, in section 4 that an adaptor may be used to import or export hypertext By enabling the registry to import hypertext, Robinson is teaching that the document may have an electronic origin. Furthermore, in section 4.4 teaches that given URL, the information can be captured on the associated web page in the registry. Again, this demonstrates that the origin of the document in the registry may be electronic and not paper.

The Examiner's position is that for Robinson to identify the coordinates from the link, as is taught in section 4.4, and use the coordinates to look up in the registry, the coordinates are thus encoded in the link on the document. The Examiner maintains that Robinson does teach determining coordinates of the referenced item, defining the link to the physical document, and encoding the coordinates in the link under the broadest reasonable interpretations of coordinates. Musk does teach a map document which contains reference items related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1 lines 32-57 and therefore suggests modifying Robinson to use and encode geographic coordinates- Robinson devotes section 6 to exploring possible applications for the DigitalDesk and thus disagrees with Applicant's position that Robinson is not concerned with how the physical and/or electronic document is used in user applications.

Robinson teaches in sections 3, 4, 4.1, and 4.4 that the interactor, or link, on the document may point to another document, for example using a URL encoded in the interactor link. Musk does teach a map document which contains reference items related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1 lines 32-57 and therefore suggests modifying Robinson to use and encode geographic coordinates. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson and Musk teaches and suggests wherein the step of encoding further includes the step of encoding an address of a second electronic document in the geographic link.

Robinson teaches in sections 3 and 4.4 that coordinates are stored in the table so that they can be looked up to yield the appropriate activity. Since the coordinates are looked up in the registry table, they must be stored in the table.

Musk teaches a map document which contains reference items related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1 lines 32-57 and therefore suggests modifying Robinson to apply the DigitalDesk to animate a map. Robinson devotes section 6 to exploring possible applications for the DigitalDesk and thus disagrees with Applicant's position that Robinson is not concerned with how the physical and/or electronic document is used in user applications. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson and Musk teaches and suggests wherein the physical document includes map.

Robinson teaches in section 4,4 that the electronic documents maybe imported from HTML documents and therefore teaches the electronic document is a hypertext markup language.

Musk teaches a map document which contains reference items related to geographic locations and identified by geographic

coordinates in fig. 2 and col. 1 tines 32-57 and therefore suggests modifying Robinson to apply the DigitalDesk to animate a map. Robinson devotes section 6 to exploring possible applications for the DigitalDesk and thus disagrees with Applicant's position that Robinson is not concerned with how the physical and/or electronic document is used in user applications. Musk does teach wherein the geographic coordinates include longitude and latitude in col. 3 lines 42-44. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson and Musk teaches and suggests wherein the geographic coordinates include longitude and latitude.
Robinson shows in figure 2 and describes in section 4.2 that marks on the printed page are used to facilitate the recognition and location on the desktop. Determining the location is the calibration relationship and requires computing coordinates so that the interactors can be correctly recognized. The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. Also, the Examiner notes that Robinson teaches providing visual feedback in fig. 1 and section 5. Thompson teaches a TOLED in the abstract and fig. 2, one of the basic and notoriously well-known uses of a display is to provide feedback to a user. Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk and Thompson teaches and suggests a TOLED display providing feedback to a user.
Robinson shows in figure 2 and describes in section 4.2 that marks on the printed page are used to facilitate the recognition and location on the desktop. Determining the location is the calibration relationship and requires computing coordinates so that the interactors can be correctly recognized- The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 6 as being unpatentable over Robinson, Musk, and Thompson.
The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. The Examiner also notes that Robinson teaches providing visual feedback in fig. 1 and section 5. Thompson teaches a TOLED in the abstract and fig, 2- One of the basic and notoriously well known uses of a display is to provide feedback to a user. Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk and Thompson teaches and suggests a TOLED display providing feedback to a user.
Robinson teaches in section 4.1 that the animated documents may be created with a WYSIWYG editor, or in other words and electronic document editor. Therefore, the documents maybe created in electronic form prior to being printed out. Robinson offers further evidence of this in sections 4 and 4.4, in section 4 that an adaptor may be used to import or export hypertext. By enabling the registry to import hypertext, Robinson is teaching that the document may have an electronic origin. Furthermore, in section 4.4 teaches that given URL, the information can be captured on the associated web page in the registry. Again, this demonstrates that the origin of the document in the registry may be electronic and not paper. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson and Musk does teach the electronic document not being derived from the physical document. Robinson shows in figure 2 and describes in section 4.2 that marks on the printed page are used to facilitate the recognition and location on the desktop. Determining the location is the calibration relationship and requires computing coordinates so that the interactors can be correctly recognized. The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. Finally, the Examiner notes that Robinson teaches providing visual feedback in fig. 1 and section 5. Thompson teaches a TOLED in the abstract and fig. 2. One of the basic and notoriously well known uses of a display is to provide feedback to a user. Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk and Thompson teaches and suggests a TOLED display providing feedback to a user.
Robinson shows in figure 2 and describes in section 4.2 that marks on the printed page are used to facilitate the recognition and location on the desktop. Determining the location is the calibration relationship and requires computing coordinates so that the interactors can be correctly recognized. The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. The Examiner's position is that for Robinson to identify the coordinates from the link, as is taught in section 4.4, and use the coordinates to look up in the registry, the coordinates are thus encoded in the link on the document. The Examiner maintains that Robinson does teach determining coordinates of the referenced item, defining the link to the physical document, and encoding the coordinates in the link under the broadest reasonable interpretations of coordinates. Musk does teach a map document which contains reference items related to geographic locations and identified by geographic coordinates in fig. 2 and col. I lines 32-57 and therefore suggests modifying Robinson to use and encode geographic coordinates. Robinson devotes section 6 to exploring possible applications for the DigitalDesk and thus disagrees with Applicant's position that Robinson is not concerned with how the physical and/or electronic document is used in user applications. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk, and Thompson teaches and suggests for each location of the plurality of locations, computing foil coordinates of the opto-touch foil corresponding to where each location appears in the physical document, said computing utilizing the geographic coordinates of each location and the calibration relationship.
Robinson teaches in sections 3 and 4.4 that coordinates are stored in the table so that they can be looked up to yield the appropriate activity. Since the coordinates are looked up in the registry table, they must be stored in the table. The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner

believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers.
The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. The Examiner also notes that Robinson teaches providing visual feedback in fig. 1 and section 5. Thompson teaches a TOLED in the abstract and fig. 2. One of the basic and notoriously well known uses of a display is to provide feedback to a user. Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk and Thompson teaches and suggests a TOLED display providing feedback to a user.
Robinson teaches animated visual feedback for the user in fig. 1, the abstract, section 5, and section 6. Blinking fight is an animated visual feedback and Robinson is certainly capable of blinking light. Robinson teaches projecting visual feedback animations at the interactors in sections 5 and 6 and therefore teaches providing animations at specific locations on the physical document. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk, and Thompson teaches and suggests responsive to a first location of the plurality of location being selected in the electronic document, sending the foil coordinates of the first location to the opto-touch foil to cause blinking of light at a first position upon the opto-touch foil corresponding to where the first location appears in the physical document.
Robinson teaches in sections 3, 4, 4.1, and 4.4 that the interactor, or link, on the document may point to another document, for example using a URL encoded in the interactor link. Robinson teaches in sections 3 and 4.4 that coordinates are stored in the table so that they can be looked up to yield the appropriate activity. Since the coordinates are looked up in the registry table, they must be stored in the table. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk, and Thompson teaches and suggests storing an address of a second electronic document in the table.
The Examiner maintains the position that the graphics tablet taught by Robinson in section 5 is the claimed touch-foil and believes addition implied evidence that the graphics tablet is a touch foil because Robinson indicates that the graphics tablet might not work well when using a stack of papers. The Examiner believes this implies the touch foil might not accurately assess touches from the pen due to the thickness of the stack of papers. The Examiner also notes that Robinson teaches providing visual feedback in fig. 1 and section 5. Thompson teaches a TOLED in the abstract and fig. 2. One of the basic and notoriously well known uses of a display is to provide feedback to a user. Since Robinson teaches providing visual feedback, and Thompson provides an alternate technology for providing the visual feedback, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk and Thompson teaches and suggests a TOLED display providing feedback to a user.
Robinson teaches animated visual feedback for the user in fig. 1, the abstract, section 5, and section 6. Blinking light is an animated visual feedback and Robinson is certainly capable of blinking light. Robinson teaches projecting visual feedback animations at the interactors in sections 5 and 6 and therefore teaches providing animations at specific locations on the physical document. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Robinson, Musk, and Thompson teaches and suggests responsive to a first location of the plurality of location being selected in the electronic document, sending the foil coordinates of the first location to the opto-touch foil to cause blinking of light at a first position upon the opto-touch foil corresponding to where the first location appears in the physical document.

Therefor the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of claims 1-10, 18-25 and 31-38 for at least the reason cited above at this time.

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER